

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

an

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/663,812      | 09/17/2003      | Takehito Washizawa   | 116780              | 4043             |
| 25944           | 7590 09/07/2004 |                      | EXAM                | INER             |
|                 | ERRIDGE, PLC    | DUDEK, I             | JAMES A             |                  |
| P.O. BOX 199    | 928             |                      |                     |                  |
| ALEXANDR        | IA, VA 22320    | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
| ,,              |                 |                      | 2871                |                  |
|                 |                 |                      |                     |                  |

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| •  |  |  | 11   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ,  |  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |
|  |  | 10/663,812   | WASHIZAWA ET AL.   |  |  |  |
|  | Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|  |  | James A. Dudek   | 2871   |  |  |  |
| Period fo  | The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>or Reply   | pears on the cover sheet with t  | the correspondence address   |  |  |  |
| THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any earn | MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  In SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period oure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS o, cause the application to become ABAND | be timely filed  O) days will be considered timely. From the mailing date of this communication.  DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) 🗌   | Responsive to communication(s) filed on  | <u> </u>   |  |  |  |  |
| 2a) <u></u> □                                      | <i>,</i> —   | action is non-final.   |  |  |  |  |
| 3)□  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | closed in accordance with the practice under E   | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1   | 1, 453 O.G. 213.   |  |  |  |
| Disposit   | ion of Claims  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)🖂  | Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  | wn from consideration.   |  |  |  |  |
| 5)⊠  | Claim(s) <u>5-7</u> is/are allowed.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 8 is/are rejected.  |  | •  |  |  |  |
| 7)⊠  | Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) 🗌   | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o  | or election requirement.   | •  |  |  |  |
| Applicat   | ion Papers   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9)   | The specification is objected to by the Examine  | er.  |  |  |  |  |
| 10)[   | ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11)  | The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | xaminer. Note the attached O   | ffice Action or form PTO-152.  |  |  |  |
| Priority   | under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |  |  |  |  |  |
| •  | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  |  | 9(a)-(d) or (f).   |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Certified copies of the priority document   |  | ication No   |  |  |  |
|  | <ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li><li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority</li></ul>   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | application from the International Burea   |  | Served III tills Ivational Stage   |  |  |  |
| * *  | See the attached detailed Office action for a list   |  | ceived.  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachmer  | nt(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ce of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) Interview Sum   | mary (PTO-413)   |  |  |  |
| 2) Notic   | ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/M  | ail Date   |  |  |  |
|  | mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>er No(s)/Mail Date   | 5)  Notice of Inform<br>6)  Other:   | mal Patent Application (PTO-152)   |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/663,812

Art Unit: 2871

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly ancticipated by US Patent 6,674,503 ("503").

In re claim 1 and 8, 503 teaches a liquid crystal device, comprising: a liquid crystal layer, a pair of substrates sandwiching and holding the liquid crystal layer [1a and 1b]; and spacers disposed between the pair of substrates [4]; at least one of the pair of substrates having depressions formed thereon [see figure 1(b) and second full paragraph column 8], and the spacers being mainly disposed in the depressions [see figures].

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Application/Control Number: 10/663,812

Art Unit: 2871

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 503.

In re claim 2 and 4, 503 teaches the liquid crystal device according to Claim 1, but lacks the depressions being formed in the non-pixel regions. However, it was well known to position the spacers at non-display region to prevent noise. Accordingly, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the well known spacer position with 503

In re claim 4, 503 teaches the liquid crystal device according to Claim 1, but lacks a plurality of scanning electrodes being formed on one of the pair of substrates; a plurality of data electrodes being formed on the other substrate so as to intersect with the scanning electrodes; and the depressions being formed between the adjacent scanning electrodes and between the adjacent data electrodes. However, it was well known to use TFT switching devices to improve resolution and contrast. Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the well known TFT with 503.

Regarding the spacers being placed between the electrodes and pixels, it was well known not to place spacer on the pixels. In this case, 503 applies pressure and placing the spacers on a data line would increase the chances of cracking the line. Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the well known placement of spacers with 503.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art of record teaches the liquid crystal device according to Claim 2, but lacks a plurality of coloring layers being formed so as to correspond to the pixel regions; light-shielding films thinner than the coloring layers being formed between the adjacent coloring layers so as to correspond to the non-pixel regions; and the depressions being formed on the corresponding light-shielding films.

Application/Control Number: 10/663,812 Page 4

Art Unit: 2871

Claims 5-7 are allowed.

The prior art of record teaches method for fabricating a liquid crystal device that includes spacers disposed between a pair of substrates sandwiching and holding a liquid crystal layer, the method comprising: forming depressions on at least one of the substrates; and disposing the spacers in the depressions and when the solvent is evaporated, the spacers are disposed in the depressions. The prior art of record does not teach nor suggest in combination with the above steps disposing the spacers in the depressions such that when a spacer-dispersed solution prepared by dispersing the spacers in a solvent is discharged in the depressions on the substrate with a droplet-discharging method.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Dudek whose telephone number is 571-272-2290. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James A. Dudek Primary Examiner Art Unit 2871